



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/776,321 04/15/97 WUBBEN

M 29865

000116 IM22/0926  
PEARNE & GORDON LLP  
526 SUPERIOR AVENUE EAST  
SUITE 1200  
CLEVELAND OH 44114-1484

EXAMINER
----------

SHEPHERD, C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1761  
DATE MAILED:

09/26/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**08/776,321**

Applicant(s)

**Wubben et al**

Examiner

**Curtis E. Sherrer**

Group Art Unit

**1761**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Curtis E. Sherrer

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) John P. Murtaugh

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview Sep 25, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: All claims in general, specifically, claim 18

Identification of prior art discussed:

Bukovsky et al and Hoelle

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicants will consider the following: cancelling the product claims; amending the independent process claim to recite that the extract is obtained from a CO2 extract; submitting a declaration to show that Bukovski's beet pectin is not an equivalent to applicant's claimed pectin; arguing that the 103 rejection based on Hoelle is obviated because Hoelle does not make obvious the use of a CO2 extracted hop product.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

**CURTIS SHERRER  
PATENT EXAMINER**

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.